

with a stenographic shorthand machine 12 to phonetically record testimony of courtroom proceedings. The system 10 further includes a program 30 causing a computer 14 to create a synchronized record that includes stenographic outlines generated by the stenographic shorthand machine 12 as well as plain text translated from these outlines (See page 3, lines 20-30). A retrieval program 170 is executed by a computer 152 to read the plain text entries of the synchronized files generated by the computer 14 in order to enable the searching of words or phrases. (See page 5, lines 25-33). Thus, only the plain text is used for searching and, as explained above, this plain text is determined from the stenographic outline and not from any image sequences. Thus, Edge does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 11.

Furthermore, the system disclosed in Edge creates a three-part composite file that synchronizes the three major parts of the recording (i.e., the phonetic outline, the plain text and the audio/video segments) (See page 2, lines 40-48). This specific disclosure indicates that the composite file synchronizes recordings, but does not teach or suggest that the composite file contains all of these recordings. Indeed, the audio/visual signals are stored on a video recorder 20, whereas the stenographic outlines in plain text are stored separately in the computer 14 (See page 3, lines 20-30 and Fig. 1). Despite that the record created by the computer 14 includes pointers to associate portions of the audio/visual record, this is not tantamount to a teaching that the plain text used for searching is stored together with the image sequence. In contrast, claim 11 features "storing said features together with said image sequence", which is in distinction to the teachings of Edge. Accordingly, Edge further does not disclose all the elements of claim 11 and the rejection should be withdrawn, accordingly.

With respect to claims 12, 13, 19, and 20, these claims are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 11.

Claims 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edge in view of Swanson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,459). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that these claims are allowable for the reasons presented above with respect to independent claim 11 and by virtue of their dependency, either directly or indirectly, upon this claim.

The Applicant submits that claims 11-20 are allowable over the prior art of record and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Patrick B. Law

Reg. No. 41,549

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 781-6801